



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be blamed for living such a kind of life as he may judge to be the most acceptable to God.

Suppose, for instance, a man had been brought up in the belief that celibacy is an eminent Christian virtue, and that he had never read Paul's warning against false teachers, "forbidding to marry;" and suppose he had been taught, either that the Apostle Peter was unmarried, or that he lived separate from his wife, and afterwards should have learned that he made her the companion of his travels, and that Paul claimed a right for himself and Barnabas to do the same, if they thought fit (1 Cor. ix. 5, 6); and that, so far from prescribing celibacy to the clergy, Paul gives particular directions as to their wives: suppose any one had been deluded into taking a vow of celibacy by such false representations as the above, if, on having his eyes opened to the truth, he threw off that vow, the blame, whatever there might be in the whole transaction, would be entirely with those who had deceived him.

OBJECTION 39.—Protestants reprehend the Catholic Church for receiving none to holy Orders but those that voluntarily embrace and promise a life of continency, that they may the more wholly devote themselves to the service of God, free from the distraction of a married life.

Their Bible, on the contrary, gives us to understand that this is highly commendable: because, *he that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife.*—1 Cor. vii. 32, 33.

REPLY.—Whatever the Apostle does mean in this passage, it is, at least, quite clear what he does not mean. He certainly did not mean to forbid the clergy to marry, or to recommend them to make a vow of celibacy: else he would grossly contradict himself. For when he is writing to Timothy, and giving him very particular directions as to his choice of ministers, he is so far from charging him to select single men, or even to give them a preference, that he gives express directions respecting their wives and children.—See 1 Tim. iii. 2, 4, 11.

Much must depend on the kind of woman chosen for a wife. If every married man were sure to be drawn off by his wife from "caring for the things of the Lord," this would be a reason, not why the clergy alone, but why all Christians should remain single; for the Apostle is not speaking, in the passage before us, of the clergy, but of men in general. And when writing to Timothy he evidently supposes that a clergyman's wife may be, and ought to be, such a one as to prove a help rather than a hindrance in his Christian duties.

Much must depend, also, on the circumstances in which a man is placed. If he has reason to expect very fierce persecutions (as may, perhaps, have been the case with the Corinthians St. Paul was writing to), a wife and children would be likely to add to "his trouble in the flesh," which the Apostle was desirous to "spare them."—See 1 Cor. vii. 28.

And, again, if any one is about to undertake the task—as Paul and Barnabas did—of travelling from place to place to preach the Gospel, with a prospect of being frequently imprisoned, beaten, and stoned (see Acts xiv. 19) he would be wise to remain, as they did, unmarried.

If, for these, or any other good reasons, any man—clergyman or layman—is convinced that he can serve God better in a single life, for him it is plainly unnecessary that he should be bound by any prohibition or vow. And he will have this great advantage, that every one will understand his remaining single to be his own constant choice, and that he is not bound by some vow hastily made, and which, perhaps, he afterwards repents. Now, no Roman Catholic clergyman can be safe from suspicions of this kind; because it is known that, willingly or unwillingly, he must remain single. It is well known how much scandal has thence arisen.

And Protestants hold that it is "tempting God" to "put a yoke on men's necks," which it is plain the Apostle Paul never contemplated.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

ON IMAGE WORSHIP AND MIRACLES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—As your have frequently professed, through the columns of your journal, the utmost willingness to correct any misstatements which you might advance, I need make no further apology for offering a few remarks on two of the most ridiculous and unfounded charges against the Roman Catholic religion, which form prominent topics for your discussion. If your object be to revile and sneer at the religion which I profess, it is an idle task to refute any slander you may think fit to promulgate; but if you wish to appeal to the understanding of sensible men on the principles of truth and reason, it seems to me most strange that any man, possessed with the smallest degree of either, should charge a large body of Christians, as enlightened and well educated as himself, with image worship, or any other species of idolatry, and who persists in the most sanctimonious manner in using arguments from Scripture, tradition, and reason, to dissuade them from

practices which they as sanctimoniously disavow, repudiate, and abhor.

In a quotation of the November number of your journal of the conversation of the Tinnevely gentleman, and in your letter, in the December journal, from a retired East Indian, you attempt to show a similarity between the Catholic respect for images and Bramin worship. You will, probably, agree with me, that in the worship which the Greeks and Romans gave to the statues consecrated to their deities, they believed that the spirit of God dwelt in them, and that the Bramins have a similar belief. But what Roman Catholic was ever known to believe that any spirit dwelt within the Crucifixion, or the image of the Blessed Virgin, or that these representations have any power beyond any other figures of wood or stone? So particular are we to prevent the most simple-minded from erring in this particular, that one of the first things which Roman Catholic children learn in their catechism is, that these pictures and images are not to be prayed to, as they have neither life nor sense. But, it may be asked, of what use are those images and pictures, and why keep them in our churches? I have an indistinct recollection of a sentiment addressed by Cicero to Cataline, which is apposite to this subject. He tells him that "he is surprised that whilst gazing on the pictures and statues of his ancestors within his house, he is not inspired with noble thoughts, in being reminded of their virtues." Surely, not less should the representation of our crucified Redeemer inspire us with love of him, and the memorials of our saints excite us to emulate their virtues. These representations preach in a language alike intelligible to all—the learned and unlearned, the simple and wise—they elevate the mind, and stimulate devotion. And how often to the expiring sinner, when the terror of death, and torture of disease, have bewildered his senses and overpowered his faculties, does the sight of the cross recall his recollection to the duties of religion, and bring his departing soul to resignation and trust in the crucified Redeemer? If your interpretation of the first clause of the commandment, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or likeness," is in itself idolatry, you have presented to us an array of deities outnumbering the Pagan mythology in your statues of the Wellingtons, Nelsons, Williams, Georges, and a host of deified other personages; but if it is not idolatry to bestow upon them this tribute of respect, or that the veneration which you display at the inauguration of their statues, or the obeisance which is made before the empty throne, or the national flag, is not image worship, then do I say, that to place in our churches the crucifixion, the image of the Blessed Virgin, the image of St. Francis Xavier, or of St. Vincent de Paul, is not idolatry, and that it is more rational, and more becoming to a Christian to respect with this relative respect, those who have served God, than those who have served the world. Lest you might reject my expiation as not orthodox on Catholic doctrine, I shall quote for you the decision of the Council of Trent—"The images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and the other saints, are to be kept and retained, particularly in the churches, and due honour and veneration is to be paid to them. Not that we believe there is any divinity or power in them, or that anything is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be placed in them, as the heathens of old trusted in their idols."

The other matter is your extreme gullibility respecting miracles, strikingly illustrated by an anecdote from your East Indian correspondent, of his having seen at Tournay an image of the Blessed Virgin, of which the sextoness told him that it had been collecting the balls of the besiegers until it became black in the face. There is an old proverb, that travellers hear and see strange things, and I have no doubt in the Griffin's having heard this strange story, and can fancy the laughter which this wag of a sextoness (who was probably a native of Kerry) has enjoyed at the amazement of "the poor ignorant haythen," to whom she related it, and for whose special edification she made it. There are, no doubt, many similar stories extant, some invented for joke, some for roguery, and some originating in the enthusiastic and overheated imagination of religious fanaticism; but these are not to be attributed to any religion or any section of mankind. We find instances of credulity and imposition in all ages, and in spiritual as well temporal matters; knaves preying upon fools; but as to the fact of miracles, you will admit, that the Lord has worked such wonders through the medium of his servants; and that whether we regard his mighty power in causing the waters of the Red Sea to arise at the command of Moses, and afterwards to burst with overwhelming force on the host of Pharaoh, or making iron swim upon the stream at the well of Eliseus, nothing is mean or insignificant in Him. We have no reason to suppose that he has ceased in giving such proofs of His power or favour; or can we tell in what way, or by whose hands will miracles be wrought according to His will? "Who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Whilst I utterly discard such absurd stories as the pretended miracles to which you refer, no matter how great the number of rogues or fools you name, as a proof that they were believed in, yet am I willing to acknowledge the manifestation of God's power in all the ways he

may think fit to display it; but I would require the proofs of miracles to be beyond all proofs that would satisfy me on natural occurrences; proofs that must remove every doubt as to the possibility of sense or reason being deceived, and that the miracle should be something worthy of Divine wisdom and beneficence.

On this subject of which I have written, I must conclude by admitting, that there are bad practices amongst ignorant and bad Catholics; and there are forged miracles amongst the wicked and the foolish. Such things were in the Church, even in the time of the Apostles. But I do most firmly maintain that no such bad practices or forged miracles are countenanced by the Catholic Church, no more than they were countenanced by the Apostles.

SIDRACH.

We readily insert the letter of our correspondent. We could have wished, indeed, for his own sake, that he had abstained from the use of so many angry words; for we may safely appeal to the judgment of our readers, whether we have ever given insertion, since the commencement of our journal, to a single statement, the object of which was to "revile" or "slander" the faith of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. But, leaving this charge to refute itself, we must express our regret that our correspondent has overlooked a request which we have frequently made, that in the letters addressed to us, only one subject should be discussed at a time. We often find considerable difficulty in giving insertion to communications which run to an undue length; and the two subjects which "Sidrach" has introduced in his letter, are obviously of too great importance to be disposed of in a few cursory remarks. Notwithstanding this difficulty, however, we venture to make one or two observations on the letter of our correspondent.

And, in the first place, "Sidrach" has altogether misrepresented the opinions of the Greeks and Romans on the subject of image-worship. The enlightened portion of the heathen world by no means believed that the spirit of the God dwelt in the image. They used the image to recall the idea of the Deity more vividly to their minds; and it is very remarkable that the arguments by which they defended the practice of image worship against the early Fathers and apologists for Christianity, are precisely those which Roman Catholic writers now use. For example, in the writings of the Platonic philosopher, Maximus Tyrius, we find the following passage:—"As spoken language has no need of letters, which were devised as helps for human weakness, that by the aid of these signs the words might be recalled to the memory, thus the nature of the gods in no wise stands in need of statues or images; but poor, weak human nature being separated from the divinity as far as earth is from heaven, has invented these signs, upon which it bestows the divine names and appellations. Those whose memory is so strong that by a vigorous exertion of mind they can reach up to heaven and approach the divinity, have, perhaps, no need of images. But such men are rare, and you may perchance nowhere meet, even in a crowd, with a person always mindful of the deity, and who can dispense with the aid of images." Is not this, in substance, the very argument made use of by our correspondent?

"Sidrach" quotes, in support of his own views, the decree of the Council of Trent, which disavows any belief of a "divinity or power residing in the image itself." Well, the ancient heathen philosophers would have said the very same thing. "A man must be an arrant fool," said Celsus, "who believes that the stone, or the wood, or the gold is itself a god, or that it is anything else than a mere statue dedicated to the God." But whatever the Council of Trent may say, we beg leave to doubt whether Roman Catholics do not sometimes believe that a divinity or power resides in some statues more than others. If images and pictures are merely to be used as helps to the memory and imagination, according to our correspondent's theory, one image ought to do as well as another; and there would be no sense in a man's making a pilgrimage to offer up his prayers to the winking image of the Virgin Mary at Rimini, or to the image in the Casa Santa at Loretto, when he could find just as good and, perhaps, as faithful an image nearer home. It is a notorious fact, however, that the contrary doctrine is inculcated in Italy on the very highest ecclesiastical authority; and we cannot see on what grounds these pilgrimages to favourite shrines can be defended, except on the supposition that the material image or picture possesses some special virtue, which is denied to other similar objects. We would be glad to learn "Sidrach's" explanation of this seeming inconsistency.

Even if it were true, however, that the benefits which images could bestow, in quickening our zeal and devotion, were a thousandfold greater than our correspondent represents, we consider that the plain prohibition of Scripture against any use of images in religious worship ought to be a conclusive argument against their adoption. "Sidrach," indeed, attempts to prove that Protestants act inconsistently in interpreting the commandment—

* Maximi Tyrii Dias. p. 80, Lond. 1740.

† Orig. contra Cel. p. 373. Cant. 1668.

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image"—strictly, while they violate it by erecting statues to eminent warriors and others; but this objection scarcely deserves a serious reply. The commandment must be taken as a whole; and the making of a graven image or likeness, which is forbidden in the first clause, is obviously limited by the words immediately following—namely, that it must not be done for the purposes of religious worship. Such is the view which the ancient Fathers uniformly take of the meaning of this commandment. In their arguments with the heathen philosophers they continually assert that the Almighty has condemned *all* use of images in religious worship as unlawful, whatever plausible reasons may be adduced in its support; and we cannot but lament the perversity which induces the Church of Rome, notwithstanding the plain declarations of both Scripture and primitive antiquity, to cling so pertinaciously to what we conceive to be a very dangerous error.

We have left ourselves space but for a word or two on the second subject in our correspondent's letter—namely, the miracles ascribed to Roman Catholic saints. "Sidrach" charges us with extreme gullibility, but we cannot see upon what grounds. Our East Indian correspondent stated two facts of which he was personally cognizant—namely, that there is a black image of the Virgin to be seen in a church at Tournay, and that the sextoness gave him a particular explanation of the origin of the phenomenon. We ask, what proof is this of gullibility? Our correspondent, we may confidently affirm, did not himself believe the story, nor did we. But "Sidrach," while declaiming loudly against knavery and credulity, does not explain why the priests of the Church of Rome allowed the black image to be erected in the Church of Tournay, unless they wished the people to believe the supposed miracle. The statue clearly could not have been placed there against their will; and unless they were illiterate, they could scarcely have imagined that the Virgin really had a black face. They either believed the miracle themselves, or they wished the people of Tournay to believe it; and in either case we fear that "Sidrach's" charges of knavery and credulity are but too truly applicable somewhere. We gladly concur with him in the very just remarks which he makes on the general character of miraculous interpositions, and the evidence by which they ought to be supported; but we shall hereafter, perhaps, take occasion to examine how far the principles which he so correctly lays down tend to establish or to refute some of the miracles which are sanctioned and acknowledged by the Church of Rome.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In your January number, in the article on the "Touchstone," reply to objection 24, the following passage appears:—"And Roman Catholics themselves must maintain that the words of institution cannot be understood absolutely literally; since, if we understand these words in their most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." As you wish your correspondents to confine themselves to a single question in each letter, I shall, in this, confine myself to a few remarks upon the above passage, and shall not inquire into the truth or validity of the other arguments in the paper on the "Touchstone." It appears to me that, in your other reasons in reply to this objection, you can have but little confidence yourself, when you are compelled, in aid of them, to resort to such a reason as that contained in the passage I have quoted. In the first place, when you speak of Roman Catholics understanding "the words of institution" in a particular sense, you depart from the question in dispute. The question has no reference to "the words of institution," but to that part of those words which contains the assertion. Your proposition is, that the assertion, "this is my blood," must be taken figuratively, because the word "this" relates to an antecedent which is used in a figurative sense. This is your argument put into plain language; and it is no less illogical than would be the general proposition that wherever the subject is a figurative expression, the predicate, or the thing predicated of it, cannot be taken in a literal, but must be taken in a figurative sense.

I will take, as an illustration, a passage from your Protestant version of the Psalms:—"Mark the perfect man and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." The word "upright," in its primary and literal sense, signifies "straight;" but, like many other words, it has acquired a figurative sense when applied to other than sensible objects, which sense is as well known and as generally received as its primary sense, or perhaps more so. If you asked me whether I understood the words—"the end of that man is peace"—in a literal or a figurative sense, and I answered, in a literal sense, you might or might not agree with me; but if I said, I can only understand them in a figurative sense, because if I took them in a literal sense I should also take the word "upright" in the same sense; and then it would follow that none but straight-backed men could hope for this promise of a peaceful end. If you did not laugh at my folly, you would, in your next number, assure

your "respected correspondent" that he had been guilty of very bad logic. The word "cup," however, to express the liquor in the cup, is as well known in that sense as in its literal sense. When we say "the kettle boils," though we use a figurative expression, yet we use an expression as well understood as the expression "the water in the kettle boils;" and so, in the 22nd Psalm (Douay version), the words, "the chalice which inebrieth me," is as familiar in its meaning as if it had been said "the liquor in the chalice." Independent of this, there is nothing in the Gospel to show that the word "this," in the words of institution, relates to the cup at all; but, on the contrary, the context shows that the liquor, and not the cup, is spoken of and referred to. Thus, in St. Matt. xxvi. 27, it is said—"And taking the chalice, he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, drink ye all of this." *ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, "out of this." Drink what? Plainly, what was in the cup. And then, v. 27, our Saviour continues—"For this is my blood of the New Testament," &c. What is this? Plainly, what he had spoken of immediately before; what was in the chalice, and what he calls in the next verse—"this fruit of the vine." So, in St. Mark xiv. 23, it is said—"And having taken the chalice, and given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it;" not of the cup taken literally, which would be nonsense; but of the wine (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, again), "from," or "out of it." Then follow the words—"And he said to them, This is my blood," &c. So far the word "this" may as well apply to one object as another; it does not, even grammatically, necessarily apply to the cup any more than its contents. There is, however, in Luke xxii. 20, the expression—"This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood." Here the word "this" plainly relates to "chalice;" but unfortunately for your argument this chalice, taking it literally, is not asserted to be blood, but to be the testament in our Lord's blood. This is all that is to be found in the New Testament on this subject; and I, therefore, assert, that even in its literal sense, the cup or chalice is not asserted to be the blood. I also assert that the use of the name of a vessel to signify the thing contained in the vessel is so familiar in vulgar use, as to have, as it were, lost its figurative form in our minds, and that it cannot, therefore, be spoken of as a figurative expression, in the same manner as Protestants contend that the expression, "this is my blood," must be considered. And, lastly, I assert, that if the word "chalice" were ever so figurative, as here used, and if the word "this" ever so clearly applied to it, it would not follow that the rest of the sentence might not be read in its most literal sense; and that whether our Saviour spoke of the cup or the wine, would be a matter of perfect indifference, so far as relates to the question, in what sense the assertion he makes of that object, be it the cup or be it the wine, is to be understood.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
CATHOLICUS.

Our "respected correspondent," if we may venture to call him so without being taunted with the civility, has quite mistaken our meaning, in supposing that while we urge our friends and opponents to limit their communications to one subject at a time, we desire that they should confine themselves to a small part of a subject, or a single argument on one side or the other of any subject; on the contrary, we cordially desire that those who differ with us should come forward freely and manfully, and grapple with our arguments, and the whole of our arguments, upon every subject we discuss in our pages, and show us where we are in error, if we be so. We shall not be at all slow at admitting an error, either in matter of opinion or argument, if clear reasons be given us that it is an error. In the present case, our correspondent, "Catholicus," has not attempted to grapple with the main and important subject in question, whether our Blessed Lord spoke in a literal or in a figurative sense, when he said—"Take, eat; this is my body," and "This is my blood of the New Testament;" but merely criticizes an isolated argument, that "if we are to understand these words in the most literal sense, we must believe that it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, which is changed into blood." "Catholicus" is right in trying *this* by the rules of common sense; and ought, in order to be consistent, to be equally ready to try the meaning of the words—"Take, eat; this is my body," by the rule of common sense.

We may readily admit (what seems to be the whole drift of his argument) that whatever may be the exact form of words used, if we are quite sure what will be understood by them by the persons addressed, that it is enough; and that must be the *true* sense, unless the contrary is distinctly stated. When we say "the kettle boils," every one understands us to mean, "the water." When we say, pointing to a map—"This is England, and this is France," no one understands us to mean that England is literally a sheet of paper. And when Jesus, who had a few hours before called himself a shepherd, and a door, and a vine, took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples; and also took the cup, and gave it to them to drink; they certainly could not understand him to mean that he was holding his own body in his own hands, and

asking them to drink out of the cup his own blood, which they knew was still in his living body washed and not in the cup of wine. The *natural* sense of his words was the *figurative*; and if the Disciples were mistaken in so understanding him, of which there is no proof whatever, when and where is the mistake explained?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—A layman often runs the risk of bringing forward as a novelty some combination of facts and arguments that the theologian thinks too familiar to mention. If, however, the information be such as is but little known to the unlearned, then to give it an extended publicity may effect as much practical good as to discover it for the first time. I, therefore, venture to call your attention to a text incessantly paraded as a proof of most various doctrines, and to a commentary on it that is little known, at least among us laymen. I mean the verse, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Mat. xvi. 18.

The infallibility of the Church—meaning thereby its ecclesiastics—the infallibility of the Pope, and the necessity for adding the latter to the former, to produce an infallible resultant, are, by turns, proved by this isolated passage. It is quoted by the ignorant, who have no knowledge of Scripture but through such traditional quotations, and with more caution by the skilful controversialist. The Italian, who cannot see the Word of God, and learns his theology from the paintings, sculpture, and decorations of his temples, sees this verse written in gigantic letters of gold, some ten feet long, beneath the majestic dome of the fabric dedicated to the apostle whose successors it is supposed thus to exalt to superhuman power. In short, it meets one so often that it is natural to ask, not only what is its true meaning, but what is the interpretation given by the infallible interpreter, which all Roman Catholics are bound to accept as true. I do not profess to have discovered any such for the entire passage, though at some pains to do so; but I think there is one tolerably distinct upon the most important point—namely, What is the *foundation* on which the Church is built?

You, sir, may point out what has been said by the Fathers; my researches suffice to show that there is, at least, not that "unanimous consent" the Roman Catholic creed demands. The foundation is variously given—as St. Peter—as St. Peter with the Popes claiming as his successors—as our Lord himself—or as the confession of faith in Christ just made by St. Peter, and which called forth the expression. The second alone supplies Roman Catholics with any peculiar argument in their favour, and to the latter Protestants can offer no objection in point of doctrine, even if they do not quite agree in its correctness. Would it not be strange if this were the very interpretation that Roman Catholics are bound to adopt? I must believe it to be so, until some equally authoritative council shall rescind, or explain so as to annul, the following passage in the celebrated Council of Trent. * After noticing the propriety of opening their proceedings with a solemn confession of faith, it thus proceeds—"Wherefore it has thought good that the symbol of faith, which the Holy Roman Church makes use of, as being that principle wherein all who profess the faith of Christ must necessarily agree, and that firm and ONLY FOUNDATION against which the gates of hell shall never prevail,† be expressed in the very same words in which it is read in all the churches; which is as follows." Here is given the Creed, known as the Nicene, in the words given in the note,‡ and which every Protestant cordially believes, and will readily accept as the foundation of his faith and hopes, as well as of those believers, throughout all times and places, who form the Church to which he claims to belong. The language of the council is distinct: the reference identifies its object. Those who assert the infallibility of the council must yield to its decree. If they say I am mistaken in the meaning I put on it, let them point out how and why; I have as much right and capacity to explain its language as they, for in that they claim no infallible assistance. Who shall interpret the interpreters? But, in truth, there is no ambiguity; it is plainly stated, that the *only* foundation,

* Session III.

† "Matt. xvi." The original edition has no marginal references whatsoever to texts of Scripture; but those printed since, under ecclesiastical sanction, have, though it is hardly requisite that so familiar a verse should be thus formally identified.

‡ "I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; and born of the Father before all ages; God of God, light of light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from the heavens, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate; he suffered and was buried; and he rose again on the third day, according to the Scriptures; and he ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and again will come with glory to judge the living and the dead; of whose kingdom there shall be no end; and in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and Son; who with the Father and the Son together, is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets: and one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."